Date of Discovery: 6 August 2025

The Quantification of Human Processes in Real-World Applications: Relative Impact Quotient (Ψ) Theory

Author: [redacted]
Date: 8 August 2025
Abstract:
This document presents the development and theoretical framework of the Relative Impact Quotient (Ψ), a quantitative model designed to measure the relative significance or impact of actions/decisions on a particular goal or stimulus. Ψ translates intuitive assessments of "how much it matters" into a formal, scalable mathematical construct, bridging concepts from decision theory, physics, and behavioral science.

Introduction

Humans often face decisions where the consequences vary in magnitude and direction, yet intuitive judgment about their importance can be vague. The Relative Impact Quotient (Ψ) seeks to formalize this intuition by assigning a numeric value to the impact of actions relative to a defined goal, enabling clearer understanding and decision-making.

Key Words

Relative Impact Quotient (RIQ): A numerical value representing how much a factor matters within the study.

Matters: A term indicating the importance of an action in relation to a specific query.

Impact: The measurable effect of how much something matters in the case.

Relative Impact: The impact measured within the scope of the given query.

Overall Impact: The combined impact considering other constraints and RIQs.

Magnitude: A measure of the potential scope or strength of an action's effect.

Effort: A quantifiable value representing the work or resources needed to perform an action.

Primer: The initial or precedent action/stimulus in determining impact.

Remedy: The proposed action/stimulus to affect the circumstance of the primer.

Intention: An aspect of RIQ calculation of whether or not the action is in-line, or opposite to the nature of the circumstance. Ex: while participating in a charity event (positive environment), you then donate $1,000 to match another donor (positive action), which determines the inherent effect of what's planned to be done and variables within.

Discovery Background

The origin of this research lies in a philosophical exploration inspired by existential questions: What does it truly mean to *do* something? What does it mean to be a good person? How can one know if they have an impact? These fundamental inquiries often resist precise, quantitative measurement, especially when considered in metaphysical or abstract contexts.

Throughout history, concepts like Karma, Fate, Free Will, Luck, and Chi have offered various frameworks to explain influence and consequence—yet they often fall into the realm of the supernatural or unverifiable energies. This divide between the natural and the supernatural presents a barrier to developing consistent, measurable models that account for broader, more complex interactions.

What if there were a way to bridge this gap?

Two foundational principles provided stepping stones: Newton's third law of motion—every action produces an equal and opposite reaction—and the law of conservation of mass, which states that matter cannot be created or destroyed, only transformed. From these principles, it follows that matter and energy exist in fixed quantities, potentially infinite in scale.

Acknowledging this, and inspired by modern physics—especially string theory, which posits that all elements of spacetime are interconnected—it becomes plausible to consider that intuition, foresight, and heuristic decision-making could be framed mathematically. In other words, predictions, assumptions, and "gut feelings" might be quantifiable and integrated into a formal model that spans the natural and what might traditionally be considered supernatural or metaphysical.

This research proposes the Relative Impact Quotient as a bridge between intuition and rigorous analysis, uniting the possible and the seemingly impossible within a coherent, mathematical framework.

Theoretical Foundation

The Relative Impact Quotient (Ψ) draws from diverse scientific and conceptual frameworks that, when combined, provide a multidimensional way to measure the "weight" of an action or decision. These domains ensure the theory addresses both physical laws and the complex realities of human behavior.

- **Newtonian Mechanics** – Establishes the foundational concept that every action produces a proportional reaction, offering a structured cause-and-effect model.
- **Einstein's Relativity** – Emphasizes that impact is dependent on context, perspective, and the observer's frame of reference.
- **Quantum Mechanics & String Theory** – Capture uncertainty, hidden variables, and interconnected systems where even minor changes can ripple unpredictably.
- **Probability & Statistics** – Provide the quantitative tools to assess likelihood, magnitude, and variability of outcomes.
- **Cognitive & Behavioral Science with Decision & Systems Theories** – Explores how humans perceive, decide, and act within interconnected systems, integrating psychological factors, feedback loops, and emergent patterns that influence outcomes beyond immediate cause-and-effect. *Ex: Cost-benefit Analysis (CBA), Game Theory*, *Multi-Attribute Utility Theory (MAUT).*

Defining Ψ (Psi)

Ψ *(psi)* represents the relative impact of a single action or decision and is calculated as:

$$\Psi = V\left(\frac{M \times P}{E \times T}\right)$$

Where variables defined as:

- M = Magnitude of the action's direct effect
- P = Probability or likelihood of effect realization
- V = Valence, indicating positive (+1) or negative (–1) impact
- E = Effort or resource cost of the action
- T = Time factor, representing the duration or timeliness of the action

In expanded form, to calculate for impact (Ψ):

$$Impact = Valence\left(\frac{Magnitude \times Probability}{Effort \times Time}\right)$$

Relative Impact & Contextualization

To understand the significance of Ψ values in context, we must firstly understand the **RIQ** standalone by itself. This is to contextualize the act itself overall of the infinite things to happen, but in a respective, realistic scope. This avoids existential and egregious clauses affecting true impact: “Will eating a donut really affect me becoming a lawyer?” However, such a thing can be factored in; you need a neutral ground calculation as a baseline.

To calculate the **relative impact quotient** of an action, use the basic equation:

$$\Psi = V\left(\frac{M \times P}{E \times T}\right)$$

Based on this calculation, which will have factored in our standard constraints, it will determine the **impact (Ψ)** of said action. Meaning, taking the bus to work one day could be a better option, a better impact on circumstances, than if you were to bike to work that day.

In mathematical context:

$$\Psi bus = 2.113;\ \Psi bike = 0.667$$

Though both positive values, taking the bus still makes a better impact, it matters more if you take the bus rather than the bike. For what reason, that is either determined or to be determined.

Now, let’s really get into the thick of it—comparing outcomes, decisions, and action-reaction. Welcome to the real meat of how to know **how much things really matter**. You can put your scope however you want. We can make it as minute as possible (ex: sleeping in one hour or waking up early one hour), or as intense as possible (recovering after being canceled on the internet in an effort to reconcile).

Introducing specific subscripts: **primer** and **remedy**. The primer is the impact an initial stimulus has on a particular context. Your pre-context could be an upstanding employee, your primer is being late for work two weeks straight, and your remedy is working more often, longer, and proficiently.

With these two in mind, we utilize these to determine the impact each action has, all the while finding out how the remedy will impact the primer. We call this syntax Ψ**overall**.

We utilize the base equation of finding the RIQ to get our values. Calculate like the following, starting with the primer:

$$\Psi primer = V\left(\frac{M \times P}{E \times T}\right)$$

Then, calculate the RIQ of the proposed action with the same equation:

$$\Psi remedy = V\left(\frac{M \times P}{E \times T}\right)$$

Now that we have our RIQs, we know how each action impacts the situation at hand. Let's calculate the overall impact they have; will the remedy have a bigger impact than the primer, and if so or not, in what way?

To find the **overall relative impact** of the remedy on the primer, take the summation of the two:

$$\Psi overall = \Psi remedy + \Psi primer$$

Ψ**overall** represents two things. **(1)** how the remedy changes the impact from the primer, and **(2)** can determine the overall impact to any scope potentially, hence the relative impact aspect. Let's analyze a few outcomes and interpret their meanings.

In this first result, we have a **Ψprimer** of **-0.435**, indicating the primer negatively, or unfavorably changes the circumstance.

$$\Psi primer = -0.435$$

We then want to know the value of **Ψremedy**, which we find to be:

$$\Psi remedy = +1.5004$$

It is very important to notate the direction, namely the *Valence*, meaning the positive or negative of an impact this has, especially at its base. It is necessary so that Ψoverall can be calculated; Ψprimer and Ψremedy need to be isolated at first. It is also crucial to note here that you must know whether the primer has already occurred or not, or will occur, which can affect calculations. If primer already occurred, you need not sum out the two since in this case **Ψremedy = Ψoverall .**

Now, calculate Ψoverall. This value determines whether the remedy favorably or unfavorably reacts. In the nature of calculations, intention (or inherent effect) of what will be factored into solving for the impact will be accounted for.

$$\Psi overall = \Psi remedy + \Psi primer$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\Psi overall = (+ 1.5004) + (- 0.435)$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\Psi overall = (+ 1.0654)$$

This working framework allows for a logical process in impact calculations, albeit this is just seeing how the story ends. What is needed in the world and in the community is determining the values of our variables.

Application Example: Diet and Weight Loss

To understand how Impact works day-to-day, we articulated an example to exercise and weight loss. The scenario of this example explores losing 20 lbs of weight in a time frame of 3 months. What is important to note and factor in is this acute incident of binge eating. We want to determine the overall impact of that binge eating incident to the weight loss journey. We will be assuming we have favorable variables within our weight loss journey, such as consistent proper dieting and exercise, just to name a few.

So let's define our variables:

- Ψ**primer:** Lose 20 pounds in 3 months.
- Ψ**binge:** Our "Primer." One time incident of binge eating 3 donuts (+900 calories + nutrition accounted for).
- Ψ**overall:** Calculated impact of the binge on the primer

Here is another way to determine and understand impact. We can do a standalone calculation of the RIQ of the binge eating episode, because our context is that three-month, consistent work of healthy dieting. So. using the equation:

$$\Psi binge = V\left(\frac{M \times P}{E \times T}\right)$$

Now, let's plug in working numbers to solve:

$$\Psi binge = (-1)\left(\frac{0.293341 \times 1}{2 \times 92}\right)$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\Psi binge = -\frac{0.2933}{184}$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\Psi binge = -0.0016$$

Before we interpret the numbers, let's also calculate the impact on an individual day basis

$$\Psi binge = (-1)\left(\frac{0.293341 \times 1}{2 \times 1}\right)$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\Psi binge = -\frac{0.2933}{2}$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\Psi binge = -0.1467$$

Interpretation: On an individual day basis, this can be ~14.67% setback to the goal. But, it is a ~0.16% setback, a negligible one at best since we keep up the dieting.

Implications, Limitations, & Future Work

- **Quantifies intuition:** Converts vague perceptions of impact into precise, measurable values.
- **Supports decision-making:** Identifies which actions significantly advance or hinder goals, aiding clearer choices.
- **Context-sensitive:** Frames impact relative to overall objectives, reducing overreaction to minor setbacks.
- **Adaptable:** Applicable across diverse domains, including health, finance, career, and social decision-making.

- **Parameter estimation:** Accurate determination of variables M, P, V, E, and T requires empirical validation and refinement.

- **Model complexity:** Real-world decisions often involve multiple interacting factors and nonlinear relationships, challenging straightforward application.

- **Temporal dynamics:** Further research is needed to incorporate feedback loops and account for long-term, evolving consequences within the model.

Conclusion

The Relative Impact Quotient (Ψ) represents a significant advancement in the quantification of human actions and decisions within complex systems. By providing a rigorous mathematical framework that bridges intuitive judgment and empirical analysis, Ψ offers the potential to transform how impact is understood and measured across diverse fields. This innovative approach invites further interdisciplinary research to refine its parameters, validate its applicability, and extend its use in behavioral science, economics, artificial intelligence, and beyond.

Embracing and advancing the Relative Impact Quotient theory promises not only to deepen scientific understanding but also to empower individuals and organizations with clearer, data-driven insights into the true significance of their choices. It is incumbent upon the scientific community to explore and integrate this bridge between intuition and quantification, fostering new avenues for knowledge and practical application.

Works Cited

Bentham, J. (1789). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. (Classic utilitarian framework on assessing the value and impact of actions).

Boardman, A. E., Greenberg, D. H., Vining, A. R., & Weimer, D. L. (2017). *Cost-benefit analysis: Concepts and practice* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.
— Detailed guide on economic evaluation and net present value calculations.

Bohm, D. (1989). *Quantum theory*. Dover Publications.
— Discusses interpretations and foundational aspects of quantum mechanics.

Dirac, P. A. M. (1958). *The principles of quantum mechanics* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
— Classic text on the fundamental principles of quantum mechanics.

Dror, I. E., & Ross, N. L. (2018). *Decision making in action: Models and methods*. Academic Press.
— Discusses quantitative approaches to decision impact in psychology.

Einstein, A. (1905). Zur elektrodynamik bewegter körper [On the electrodynamics of moving bodies]. *Annalen der Physik*, 17, 891–921.
— Original paper introducing special relativity and the role of reference frames.

Einstein, A. (1916). The foundation of the general theory of relativity. *Annalen der Physik*, 49, 769–822.
— Foundational paper on general relativity and its implications for spacetime.

Feller, W. (1968). *An introduction to probability theory and its applications* (Vol. 1). Wiley.
— A classical reference for probability and statistical methods.

Feynman, R. P., Leighton, R. B., & Sands, M. (1964). *The Feynman lectures on physics* (Vol. 1). Addison-Wesley.
— A comprehensive introduction to classical and modern physics concepts.

Greene, B. (1999). *The elegant universe: Superstrings, hidden dimensions, and the quest for the ultimate theory*. W. W. Norton & Company.
— Accessible introduction to string theory and modern physics.

Halliday, D., Resnick, R., & Walker, J. (2013). *Fundamentals of physics* (10th ed.). Wiley.
— Textbook covering Newtonian mechanics and foundational physics principles.

Holland, J. H. (2014). *Complexity: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
— Overview of complex adaptive systems relevant to behavioral dynamics.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
— Classic exploration of human decision-making processes and cognitive biases.

Kahneman, D., Sibony, O., & Sunstein, C. R. (2020). Noise: A flaw in human judgment. *Science*, 370(6518), 424–428. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abd1518
— Analyzes variability in human decision impact.

Keaney, R. L., & Raiffa, H. (1993). *Decisions with multiple objectives: Preferences and value tradeoffs*. Cambridge University Press.
— Foundational text on multi-attribute utility theory and decision analysis.

Kolmogorov, A. N. (1956). *Foundations of the theory of probability*. Chelsea Publishing Company.
— The mathematical foundation for probability theory.

March, J. G. (1994). *A primer on decision making: How decisions happen*. Free Press.
— Explores how decisions are made in organizations and individuals.

Meadows, D. H. (2008). *Thinking in systems: A primer*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
— Overview of systems thinking, feedback loops, and complexity relevant to impact dynamics.

Newton, I. (1687). *Philosophiæ naturalis principia mathematica*.
— The fundamental principles of classical mechanics and cause-effect relationships.

Pearl, J. (2009). *Causality: Models, reasoning, and inference*. Cambridge University Press.
— Foundational work on causal inference and impact assessment.

Pearl, J., & Mackenzie, D. (2018). *The book of why: The new science of cause and effect*. Basic Books.
— Explores modern approaches to understanding causality and impact.

Ross, S. M. (2014). *Introduction to probability models* (12th ed.). Academic Press.
— Covers stochastic processes and probabilistic modeling.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
— Examines economic impact from a human capability perspective.

Shapley, L. S. (1953). A value for n-person games. In H. W. Kuhn & A. W. Tucker (Eds.), *Contributions to the theory of games* (Vol. 2, pp. 307–317). Princeton University Press.
— Introduces the Shapley value for quantifying individual contributions.

Simon, H. A. (1996). *The sciences of the artificial* (3rd ed.). MIT Press.
— Discusses decision-making within complex systems and bounded rationality.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124–1131. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124
— Seminal paper on cognitive heuristics affecting decision impact.

von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller.
— Foundational text in systems thinking and cybernetics.

von Neumann, J., & Morgenstern, O. (1944). *Theory of games and economic behavior*. Princeton University Press.
— The cornerstone of game theory, modeling strategic decision-making and expected utility.